

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-6, 10 and 12-15 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-6, 10 and 12-15 are rejected. Claims 2, 7-9 and 11 are previously cancelled. Claims 1 and 10 are amended herein to clarify the invention, to express the invention in alternative wording and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Applicant herein traverses and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 13 and 15 are rejected as obvious over Walker et al. (US 6,138,106) in view of Pennell (US 6,910,179) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

An on-line selling system in accordance with the present invention includes a sale processing system and a goods supply system. The sales processing system provides a Web site a user can access. In the present invention, it is possible that the goods supplier can manage only the goods supply system and use the Web site provided by someone managing the sales processing system. In this case, the goods supplier can provide a second selling program to the sale processing system by a

program-providing device. Therefore, the goods supplier can program his/her second selling program so that his/her desired selling style can be performed.

When an operation, for example a button selection, is made by a user on the Web site for providing the second process, the sales processing system provides the second selling program to the user's terminal, and the second selling program is implemented at the user's terminal. Thereby, the goods supplier has only to provide the second selling program to the sales processing system, and the goods supplier can sell his/her goods by his/her desired selling style thorough the Web site. Accordingly, the goods supplier does not need to prepare his/her own Web site, and he/she can use the already existing Web site to sell his/her goods by his/her desired selling style.

The Office Action admits that Walker fails to disclose and teach that the second buying (selling) process is different from the first buying (selling) process (see page 3). Applicants respectfully submit that Walker further fails to disclose and teach a construction wherein the second selling program for performing the second process can be prepared by a system other than the sales processing system managing the Web site.

The invention of Pennell is directed to providing the second situation of an input form where fields common to other input forms are automatically filled out, which is different from the first situation in which the input form is blank (see col.2 line 61- col. 3, line 40). As the second situation is performed by the browser automation program, the browser automation program is being equated with the

second selling program of the present invention. The visited site that a user can access is likewise apparently being equated with the Web site managed by the sales processing system.

However, the browser automation program is not prepared for each input form. The browser automation program is stored to work at the user's terminal, and determines whether there is in a user database, information available to fill a field in the input form on the visited site, and when there is, fills the information in the field automatically. Therefore, the browser automation program is simply a program for managing information common to various input forms, and is not prepared for each of various input forms.

Pennell discloses that the user database can be maintained at the home site 305 and the user's terminal can obtain the information of user database from the home site 305. Even if the home site 305 is being likened to the goods supply system, the home site 305 is prepared only for the browser automation program, and does not have any relationship with the visited site.

Therefore, it is impossible to derive from Pennell that a program is prepared for each input form and the user's terminal obtains the program from a site visited by the user. Moreover, Pennell is silent regarding the attendant convenience for the goods supplier and the relationship between the goods supplier and the visited sale processing system Web site. Therefore, derivation of a conception that a program

prepared by the goods supplier to perform his/her desired selling process could not be arrived at by one of ordinary skill in the art based upon the cited references.

Independent claim 10, directed to a method, has analogous technical features to claim 1. Thus, claim 10 also defines over the cited art of record for the same reason as claim 1, discussed above.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are not obvious in view of the cited reference(s) for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 13 and 15 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 14 are rejected as obvious over Walker et al. and Pennell in view of Satchell et al. (US 5,822,216) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection.

Satchell et al., like the Walker et al. and Pennell references, fails to teach or suggest the construction that the second selling program, to be executed on the user's terminal for realizing the second selling process, is provided to the sale processing system from the goods supply system managed by a supplier. Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations as properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are not obvious in view of the cited references for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 5 and 14 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due. If there is any fee due the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan by:  
Frank J. Jordan  
Reg. No. 20,456  
Attorney for Applicant  
and,

By Lawrence Wechsler  
Lawrence Wechsler  
Reg. No. 36,049  
Attorney for Applicant

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340